Printed: 11-10-2004

PATENT C ISA237-1 LTION TREATY



From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

То:				PCT		
see form PCT/ISA/220			WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43 <i>bis.</i> 1)			
		·	Date of mailing (day/month/year) see	e form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)		
Applicant's or agent's fi			FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below			
'''	International application No. International filing dat PCT/CA2004/000375 12.03.2004			Priority date (day/month/year) 02.04.2003		
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC A61K31/7032, A61P29/00, A61P3/06						
Applicant MTI META TECH I	NC.					
1. This opinion c	ontains indication	ons relating to the follo	owing items:			
☑ Box No. I	Basis of the op	inion				
Box No. Ⅱ	Priority					
☑ Box No. III						
☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention						
Box No. V						
☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited						
☐ Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application					
☐ Box No. VIII	Certain observa	ations on the internations	al application			
2. FURTHER ACT	ION					
written opinion o	of the Internationa	I Preliminary Examining	Authority ("IPEA"). Ho	usually be considered to be a owever, this does not apply where chosen IPEA has notifed the		

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

will not be so considered.

whichever expires later.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:

Authorized Officer

European Patent Office - Gitschiner Str. 103 D-10958 Berlin Tel. +49 30 25901 - 0

Fax: +49 30 25901 - 840

Beranová, P

Telephone No. +49 30 25901-333



International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date,



(Jan 11/05)







International application No. PCT/CA2004/000375

_							
_	В	lox N	lo. I Basis of the opinion				
1	 With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item. 						
		la	his opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following nguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).				
2			egard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and sary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:				
	a.	type	of material:				
			a sequence listing				
			table(s) related to the sequence listing				
	b.	form	at of material:				
			in written format				
			in computer readable form				
	C.	time	of filing/furnishing:				
			contained in the international application as filed.				
			filed together with the international application in computer readable form.				
			furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.				
3.		has cop	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto is been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional pies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as propriate, were furnished.				
4.	Add	ditior	nal comments:				







International application No. PCT/CA2004/000375

_							
_	Во	x No. II	Priority				
1.	1. M The fol		lowing document has not been furnished:				
		⋈	copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).				
			translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).				
Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority							
2.		has bee	inion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim on found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis.</i> 1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international te indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.				
3.	Add	litional ol	oservations, if necessary:				







International application No. PCT/CA2004/000375

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability					
Th ob	e questions whether the claimed vious), or to be industrially applic	inve	ention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non have not been examined in respect of:		
	the entire international application,				
Ø	claims Nos. 10-14,19-28				
bed	cause:				
	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. 10-14 (with respect to industrial applicability) relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):				
	see separate sheet				
	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):				
	the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinio could be formed.				
Ø	no international search report h	ıas b	een established for the whole application or for said claims Nos. 19-28		
	the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Anne C of the Administrative Instructions in that:				
	the written form		has not been furnished		
			does not comply with the standard		
٠	the computer readable form		has not been furnished		
			does not comply with the standard		
	the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.				
	See separate sheet for further of	detail	is		







International application No. PCT/CA2004/000375

_	Во	x No. IV	Lack of unity of inv	entio	n		
1	. 🛛	In resp	onse to the invitation (Form	PCT/ISA/20	06) to pay additional fees, the applicant h	as:
			paid additional fees.				
			paid additional fees ui	nder p	rotest.		
		Ø	not paid additional fee	s.			
2.		This Au	uthority found that the rollicant to pay additional	equire l fees.	ement of u	nity of invention is not complied with and	chose not to invite
3.	This	s Author	ity considers that the re	equire	ment of un	ity of invention in accordance with Rule 1	3.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
	_ (complied	l with				
	Ø 1	not comp	olied with for the follow	ing rea	asons:		
		see sej	parate sheet				
4.	Con	sequent	ly, this report has beer	estal	olished in I	espect of the following parts of the intern	ational application:
	□ all parts.						
	⊠ t	he parts	relating to claims Nos	1-18			
							•
	Box	No. V	Reasoned statemer	t und	er Rule 43 explanation	Bbis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, invense supporting such statement	ntive step or
١,	Stat	ement					
	Nov	elty (N)		Yes: No:	Claims Claims	7-9 1-6,10-18	
	Inve	ntive ste	p (IS)		Claims Claims	<u>-</u> 1-18	·
	Indiu	strial ap	plicability (IA)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-9,15-18 -	
1	Cit at	ione one	l evolunations				

Citations and explanations

see separate sheet







International application No.

PCT/CA2004/000375

Re Item III.

3.1 Claims 10 - 14 relate to subject-matter considered by this Authority to be covered by the provisions of Rule 67.1(iv) PCT. Consequently, no opinion will be formulated with respect to the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of these claims (Article 34(4)(a)(I) PCT).

Re Item IV.

- 4.1 The separate inventions are:
 - 1) Use of gangliosides for the treatment of inflammation (claims 1-18)
 - 2) Use of gangliosides for reducing plasma cholesterol (claims 19-28)

They are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (Rule 13.1 PCT) for the following reasons:

The problem underlying the present application is the treatment of inflammation and lowering plasma cholesterol. The methods of inventions 1 and 2 are different solutions to this problem, their common concept being the use of gangliosides.

The use of gangliosides is already known in the art.

Bucolo et al. (Journal of Ocular Pharmacology, 1993, 9(4), 321 - 332) report that monosialoganglioside isopropyl ester reduces primary signs of allergic inflammation of the eye (page 321, abstract).

EP0351784 relates to isopropyl ester of GM1 ganglioside with anti-inflammatory action and its use for the treatment of systemic, ophthalmic or topical pathologies (claims 1 and 2).

Oliveira and Langone (Neuroscience Letters, 2000, 293, 131 - 134) report that administration of monosialoganglioside (GM1) is neuroprotective and diminishes local inflammation (page 131, abstract).

WO95/20959 teaches about a composition comprising an anti-inflammatory amount of sialic acid or its analogue and a method for treating inflammation (claims 1 and 5).







International application No.

PCT/CA2004/000375

GB2289274 relates to sialic acid derivatives and their use for the treatment of chronic inflammation (claim 1; page 7, line 11).

WPI/Derwent abstract (AN 1989-225642 & JP1163125) mentions an antiinflammatory agent containing sialic acid.

WO90/09185 discloses a method for treating peptic ulcers comprising administration of a ganglioside (GM1 or BD1a,b) (claims 1 and 5).

The documents cited do not represent a comprehensive search for any of the defined inventions and are to be considered only as part of the prior art pertaining to the general idea underlying the present application.

In view of this prior art, the common concept identified above is not novel and the problem underlying the present application can be redefined as the provision of further compositions useful for the treatment of inflammation and lowering plasma cholesterol. If these methods are to be linked so as to form a single general inventive concept then the condition of Rule 13(1) PCT must be met, i.e. there must be a same or corresponding technical feature shared by all compositions identified in claims, which makes up the contribution to the state of the art.

Neither the claims nor the description disclose a technical feature or a technical effect linked thereto shared by all methods identified in claims 1 - 28, i.e. the method of invention 1 relates to the treatment of inflammation whereas the method of invention 2 to lowering of plasma cholesterol.

In summary, in view of the prior art cited above, the inventions 1 and 2 are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept, i.e. Rules 13(1) and 13(2) PCT have not been fulfilled. As a consequence, the application is considered to relate to at least 2 separate inventions.

The following opinion relates therefore only to invention 1, i.e. claims 1 - 18.

Re Item V.

- 5.1 The following documents are referred to in this communication:
 - D1: BUCOLO C ET AL: "EFECTS OF MIPRAGOSIDE ON OCULAR ALLERGIC INFLAMMATION IN THE RABBIT" JOURNAL OF OCULAR PHARMACOLOGY, MARY ANN LIEBERT, INC. NEW YORK, NY, US, vol. 9,







International application No.

PCT/CA2004/000375

no. 4, 1993, pages 321-332, XP000570599 ISSN: 8756-3320

D2: EP 0 351 784 A (FIDIA SPA) 24 January 1990 (1990-01-24)

D3: OLIVEIRA ALEXANDRE L R ET AL: "GM-1 ganglioside treatment reduces motoneuron death after ventral root avulsion in adult rats" NEUROSCIENCE LETTERS, vol. 293, no. 2, 27 October 2000 (2000-10-27), pages 131-134, XP002286616 ISSN: 0304-3940

D4: WO 95/20959 A (US ARMY) 10 August 1995 (1995-08-10)

D5: GB 2 289 274 A (ERBA CARLO SPA; PHARMACIA SPA (IT)) 15 November 1995 (1995-11-15)

D6: DATABASE WPI Section Ch, Week 198931 Derwent Publications Ltd., London, GB; Class A96, AN 1989-225642 XP002286617 &; JP 01 163125 A (SHISEIDO CO LTD) 27 June 1989 (1989-06-27)

D7: WO 90/09185 A (ANGIO MEDICAL CORP) 23 August 1990 (1990-08-23)

5.2 In light of the documents cited in the international search report, the invention as claimed (claims 1 - 6 and 10 - 18) does not appear to meet the criteria mentioned in Article 33(1) PCT, i.e. does not appear to be novel and to involve an inventive step for the following reasons:

Document D1 reports that monosialoganglioside (GM1) isopropyl ester reduces primary signs of allergic inflammation of the eye (page 321, abstract). This document is therefore considered to be relevant for novelty and inventive step of the subject-matter of claims 1 - 6 and 10 - 18.

D2 discloses isopropyl ester of GM1 ganglioside with anti-inflammatory action and its use for the treatment of systemic, ophthalmic or topical pathologies (claims 1 and 2).

D3 reports that administration of monosialoganglioside (GM1) is neuroprotective and diminishes local inflammation (page 131, abstract).

Both D2 and D3 are thus novelty-destroying for claims 1 - 3, 5, 6, 10, 12 and 14 - 18.

D4 relates to a composition comprising an anti-inflammatory amount of sialic acid or its analogue and a method of treating inflammation (claims 1 and 5).

D5 teaches about sialic acid derivatives and their use for the treatment of chronic inflammation (claim 1; page 7, line 11).

D6 mentions an anti-inflammatory agent containing sialic acid (abstract).

Documents D4 - D6 are thus considered to be relevant for novelty of claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17 and 18.







International application No.

PCT/CA2004/000375

Document D7 discloses a method of treating peptic ulcers comprising administration of a ganglioside (GM1 or GD1a,b) (claims 1 and 5). Thus, it destroys novelty of claims 1 and 5.

- 5.3 Dependent claims 7 9, although formally novel, do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).
- 5.4 For the assessment of the present claims 10 14 on the question whether they are industrially applicable, no unified criteria exist in the PCT Contracting States. The patentability can also be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize as industrially applicable the subject-matter of claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow, however, claims to a known compound for first use in medical treatment and the use of such a compound for the manufacture of a medicament for a new medical treatment.

